Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

REMARKS

The subject patent application has been transferred to the law firm of Quarles & Brady. The undersigned attorney has assumed responsibility for prosecution of the subject application.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-40 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 5694551 (Doyle). The Office Action rejects claims 14, 28, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle in view of US Patent 6889197 (Lidow). Applicants have cancelled claims 7-42. The 103 rejections with respect to those claims are considered moot.

Applicants traverse the grounds of the rejection based on the Lidow reference. The priority date of the subject application is December 14, 2000, based on US provisional application 60/255,156. The Lidow non-provisional patent application has a filing date of January 11, 2001, which is after Applicant's priority date. Although the Lidow reference claims priority to US provisional applications 60/213,279, filed June 22, 2000 and 60/175,868, filed January 12, 2000. The Lidow non-provisional application is effective as prior art to the earlier dates only to the extent that the disclosure in the provisional applications supports the non-provisional application. Applicants believed the features of the amended and new claims are not found in the provisional applications.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants have amended the claim to recite a method for sharing, tracking and updating supply chain purchasing transactions comprising the steps of creating a

-11-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

central database for storing and sharing components of
purchasing transactions, including purchase orders and delivery
orders, assigning a plurality of users an access authorization
level to each purchasing transaction in the central database,
wherein the access authorization level to the purchasing
transactions for each of the plurality of users is controlled by
a filter, providing a purchase order module made selectively
available to the plurality of users in the supply chain based on
the access authorization level, the purchase order module having
access to the central database for importing, accessing, and
updating a purchase order having user defined attributes,
providing a delivery order module made selectively available to
the plurality of users in the supply chain based on the access
authorization level, the delivery order module having access to
the central database for creating a delivery order having user
defined attributes corresponding to the purchase order, and
providing a monitoring module made selectively available to the
plurality of users in the supply chain based on the access
authorization level, the monitoring module having access to the
central database to allow authorized users to access and update
the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central
database.

The Doyle reference does not teach or suggest the step of
assigning a plurality of users an access authorization level to
each purchasing transaction in the central database. The access
authorization level to the purchasing transactions for each of
the plurality of users is controlled by a filter. Doyle does
not consider individually controllable access authorization for
the users to the data records. Furthermore, Doyle does not use

-12-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

a purchase order module that is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain based on the access authorization level. Not all users have access to all records. Access to the purchase transactions records for each user is controlled by the filter according to their access authorization level. The selective authorization feature is necessary to data security and integrity. The purchase order module has access to the central database for importing, accessing, and updating a purchase order having user defined attributes. Doyle does not make purchase orders selectively available to users through a central database based on the access authorization level. Doyle does not use a delivery order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain based on the access authorization level. The delivery order module has access to the central database for creating a delivery order having user defined attributes corresponding to the purchase order. Doyle does not make delivery orders selectively available to users through a central database based on the access authorization level. Finally, Doyle does not use a monitoring module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain based on the access authorization level. The monitoring module has access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database. Doyle does not allow updates to the purchase orders and delivery orders to be made selectively available to users through a central database based on the access authorization level.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over the Doyle reference. Claims 2-6 are believed to be in

-13-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicants have added new claims 43-66.

New claim 43 recites a computer-implemented method for sharing supply chain purchasing transactions comprising the steps of creating a central database for storing and sharing components of purchasing transactions, including purchase orders and delivery orders, providing a purchase order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain, the purchase order module having access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order, providing a delivery order module made selectively available to the plurality of users in the supply chain, the delivery order module having access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase order, and providing a monitoring module made selectively available to the plurality of users in the supply chain, the monitoring module having access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database.

None of the prior art references of record teach or suggest a purchase order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. Not all users have access to all records. Access to the purchase transactions records for each user is controlled by the filter according to their access authorization level. The selective authorization feature is necessary to data security and integrity. The purchase order module has access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order. The prior art of

-14-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

record does not make purchase orders selectively available to users through a central database. The prior art of record does not use a delivery order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The delivery order module has access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase order. The prior art of record does not make delivery orders selectively available to users through a central database. Finally, the prior art of record does not use a monitoring module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The monitoring module has access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database. The prior art of record does not allow updates to the purchase orders and delivery orders to be made selectively available to users through a central database.

Accordingly, claims 43-50 are believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record.

New claim 51 recites a computer program product usable with a programmable computer processor having a computer readable program code embodied therein comprising computer readable program code which (i) creates a central database for storing and sharing components of purchasing transactions, including purchase orders and delivery orders, (ii) implements a purchase order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain, the purchase order module having access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order, (iii) implements a delivery order module made selectively available to the plurality of users in the supply chain, the

-15-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

delivery order module having access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase order, and (iv) implements a monitoring module made selectively available to the plurality of users in the supply chain, the monitoring module having access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database.

None of the prior art references of record teach or suggest a purchase order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The purchase order module has access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order. The prior art of record does not make purchase orders selectively available to users through a central database. The prior art of record does not use a delivery order module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The delivery order module has access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase order. The prior art of record does not make delivery orders selectively available to users through a central database. Finally, the prior art of record does not use a monitoring module made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The monitoring module has access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database. The prior art of record does not allow updates to the purchase orders and delivery orders to be made selectively available to users through a central database.

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

Accordingly, claims 51-58 are believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record.

New claim 59 recites a computer system for sharing supply chain purchasing transactions comprising means for creating a central database for storing and sharing components of purchasing transactions, including purchase orders and delivery orders. A purchase order module is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The purchase order module has access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order. A delivery order module is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The delivery order module has access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase order. A monitoring module is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The monitoring module has access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database.

None of the prior art references of record teach or suggest a purchase order module that is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The purchase order module has access to the central database for importing and accessing a purchase order. The prior art of record does not make purchase orders selectively available to users through a central database. The prior art of record does not use a delivery order module that is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The delivery order module has access to the central database for accessing a delivery order having attributes corresponding to the purchase

-17-

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

order. The prior art of record does not make delivery orders selectively available to users through a central database. Finally, the prior art of record does not use a monitoring module that is made selectively available to a plurality of users in the supply chain. The monitoring module has access to the central database to allow authorized users to access and update the purchase orders and delivery orders stored in the central database. The prior art of record does not allow updates to the purchase orders and delivery orders to be made selectively available to users through a central database.

Accordingly, claims 59-66 are believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record.

Applicant(s) believe that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant(s) invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

Application Serial No.: 10/014,789
Sarah Metcalfe *et al.*
Preliminary Amendment in Response to Office Action mailed
5/16/2006

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,
QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP

October 12, 2006   By: _____

Robert D. Atkins
Reg. No. 34,288

Address all correspondence to:
Robert D. Atkins
Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP
One Renaissance Square
Two North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Telephone: (602) 229-5311
Facsimile: (602) 229-5690
E-mail: rda@quarles.com

-19-

QBPHX\2047692.1